

RECEIVED

Reno Public Meeting
October 4, 2001

OCT 04 2001

552261

JOHN HADDER: My name is John, J-o-h-n,

24 Hadder, H-a-d-d-e-r. I'm the Northern Nevada Director
25 of -- Northern Nevada Coordinator for Citizen Alert, and
43

1 I'm using my comments to address some of these questions,
2 and I disagree with our learned man over here.

3 First of all, let it be clear that Yucca
4 Mountain only provides between five and ten percent of
5 the containment of the radioactive waste over the 10,000
6 lifetime period. That is the Department of Energy's own
7 science saying that. The Technical -- Nuclear Waste
8 Technical Review Board required the Department of Energy
9 to peel back the engineered barriers, the manmade
10 barriers one by one and see what the mountain would
11 actually do on its own, so it provides actually very
12 little containment over the lifetime of the repository,
13 and, further, it contains very little containment over
14 the lifetime of radioactive waste, which is on the order
15 of hundreds of thousands of years.

16 Number two, Yucca Mountain was not chosen
17 because it is a good site. Other sites were not screened
18 out because they were bad. They were eliminated because
19 of public process. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act was

20 rewritten in 1987 when the Department of Energy had not
21 actually finished the screening process on all the
22 original nine sites that were selected for a study at
23 that time, so all the sites had not been studied and only
24 Yucca Mountain was then to be studied after that point,
25 so it's not a scientific basis.

552261

44

1 Number three, Yucca Mountain is an oxidizing
2 environment, which means that it creates -- which means
3 it corrodes the containers faster. It's not actually a
4 very good environment for the disposal of nuclear waste,
5 and the Department of Energy has had a lot of trouble
6 designing materials that will withstand this environment.

7 Despite the fact that it's not actually
8 saturated with water, there is a lot of water that does
9 enter into the repository cavity. In fact, one of the
10 disqualifying conditions on the original DOE site
11 suitability guidelines kicked in when it was discovered
12 that water could travel through the mountain a lot faster
13 than originally considered. The Department of Energy is
14 now rewriting those guidelines so that disqualifying
15 condition is no longer a problem. That's my perspective,
16 but they are rewriting the guidelines and all the

552261

17 disqualifying and qualifying conditions are gone.

18 The oxidizing environment also creates
19 radioactive carbon dioxide in the air as a result of the
20 radioactive carbon that's actually in the waste itself,
21 and it was determined from the original EPA guidelines
22 that were written back in 1985 that the total release of
23 carbon dioxide into the atmosphere would be beyond that
24 limit, and so we see another rewriting of guidelines. It
25 was then mandated that the EPA needed to change its

45

1 guidelines, so what we have moving forward right now,
2 just for the record, is we have very site-specific
3 guidelines. The EPA's standards right now only apply to
4 Yucca Mountain, only, so if we do go to another site, we
5 have to use the other guidelines, which were the generic
6 ones, which will probably cause a problem for that site
7 as well.

8 In terms of the -- so everything is very
9 specific. The language in the law is very specific to
10 Yucca Mountain. I just wanted to clarify that
11 information for the record. I am sorry that the
12 information we're getting from the panel is not accurate.

13 Thank you very much.